

**REMARKS**

The approval of the drawing correction filed on July 18, 2005 is gratefully acknowledged.

By the present Amendment, the Abstract has been amended in response to the objection made in the Office Action. The amendments to the Abstract include mentioning of the method for forming the helical winding by drivingly connecting the chain links to the driving device. The hyphen that the Examiner sees as being part of the title is one of the hyphens that were used, two at the beginning and two at the end, to indicate the beginning and end of an insertion in an amendment. In this instance, the second hyphen at the end of the insertion did not fit into the same line as the first hyphen, but instead printed on the next line.

In response to the continuing rejection of claims 1-49 under 35 USC 112, claims 1, 4 and 12 have been further amended for greater definiteness. More specifically, in claim 1, the first step has been amended to recite providing the plurality of chain links, and the axial advancement of the chain links in the winding guide to form the helical winding has been moved to a separate step for operating the driving device. In claim 4, the wording has been made more consistent by the use of the qualification "additional" for the plurality of chain links and the winding guide means, as well as the spindle member, to clarify that each of these entities is in addition to the at least one corresponding entity in claim 1. Claim 12 has been reworded for better consistency with claim 1.

The courtesy of the Examiner in granting an interview to the applicant's attorney is gratefully acknowledged. During the interview, the Examiner and the applicant's attorney discussed all of the Examiner's proposed changes for claims 1-12. He said that he did not have time to discuss the other claims, but it was agreed that the applicant's attorney would look

through the other claims for the types of terms and expressions that the Examiner found unacceptable in claims 1-12. The Examiner pointed to the expression “mutual height displacement” in claim 8, which he found to be indefinite. A similar expression appears in claim 31. The Examiner indicated that he would work with the applicant’s attorney to determine suitable claim terms in even further discussion, if he finds that not all of the indefiniteness issues are resolved by the next response to the final Office Action.


The present amendment is believed to incorporate all of the changes suggested by the Examiner, and it includes some other changes that improve the clarity of the claims. The “mutual height displacement” of claim 8 and similar expressions in claims 11 and 31 have been replaced with definite expressions. The “height” in claims 8 and 31 was intended to refer to the typical application of the invention in a device for height adjustment of furniture, such as height adjustable tables and office desks, and the like. It is believed that the present Amendment places the application in condition for allowance. However, if the Examiner finds that any issues remain to be resolved, he is invited to call the undersigned at the number given below.

Serial No. 09/647,994  
Docket No. IPB.004

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Deposit Account No. 50-0562.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 1-19-06

  
John P. Shannon  
Registration No. 29,276

**Merek, Blackmon & Voorhees, LLC**  
673 South Washington Street  
Alexandria, VA 22314  
(703) 684-5633  
**Customer No. 48234**

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

on 1-19-06

  
John P. Shannon